
Chapter IV – Personnel Guidelines and Procedures

A. Introduction

The Board of Trustees has the power has the power of appointment and removal of faculty members, and may fix the compensation of each. All appointments to the teaching faculty of Whitman College shall be made by the Board of Trustees on recommendation of the President of the College.

The Board of Trustees retains the ultimate authority in all personnel matters. The Board of Trustees, in turn, acts upon the recommendation of the President. Before making recommendations to the Board of Trustees, the President consults with the appropriate faculty committees. The Faculty Personnel Committee makes recommendations to the President and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty regarding tenure, promotion, and contract renewal of faculty members who are on the tenure-track, as well as promotions to the senior rank for non-tenure-track faculty. Department Chairs and Program Directors work with the Associate Deans regarding hiring and retention of Visiting Assistant Professors and Adjunct Faculty. Although the President may consult with these committees and individuals, the President is not required to follow their recommendations.

B. Tenure-Track Positions

1. Initial Appointment and the Probationary Period

Initial appointments at the rank of assistant professor are usually for a term of three academic years, with a second three-year term after a successful contract renewal review by the Faculty Personnel Committee. If the faculty member has at least four years of teaching experience at the college level, the Provost and the faculty member may agree, at the time of appointment, on a four-year timeline towards tenure. In these cases, the initial appointment will be for two years, with the second two-year appointment following the successful review by the Faculty Personnel Committee, and the tenure review occurring in the fall of the fourth year. Initial appointments at the rank of associate professor and professor will usually be accompanied by a shorter timeline towards tenure.

At the time of initial appointment to a tenure-track position, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will indicate in writing the year the faculty member will be considered for tenure by the Faculty Personnel

Committee.

2. Annual Review

Tenure-track faculty are expected to complete an Annual Activity Report each year. The Activity Report will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the relevant Division Chair for the purposes of salary decisions.

3. Formative Review of Pre-Tenure Tenure-Track Faculty

A formative review of pre-tenure tenure-track faculty during their initial three-year appointment. While pre-tenure faculty on a two-year initial appointment do not have time to engage in the full formative review, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development is available in the first year for consultation regarding the contract renewal review scheduled for the fall of the second year.

The formative review is designed to provide faculty members with conscientious, timely feedback in three areas: teaching, scholarship, and service. This feedback can be used to confirm the success of current practices, identify areas and strategies for improvement, and provide guidance in the preparation of the dossier for contract renewal and tenure applications. The formative review is intended for individual use; it is distinct from Personnel Committee reviews of contract renewal and tenure applications and plays no direct role in these more formal evaluations.

At the end of the first year of an initial appointment, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development (ADFD) will provide information to the faculty member regarding the purpose of the formative review and the process to be followed. In consultation with the ADFD, the pre-tenure faculty member will identify at least two tenured faculty members (at least one of whom is a member of the candidate's department) who will visit a minimum of two class sessions of the pre-tenure colleague. In addition, the ADFD and the pre-tenure faculty member will discuss and come to an agreement about what other sources of information will offer the opportunity for meaningful feedback in the three areas. None of the following is required, but possible materials might include a current curriculum vita, course syllabi and/or other relevant pedagogical

materials, student evaluations, annual activity reports, or evidence of professional activity. The faculty member should select those materials that, in combination, they believe will allow colleagues to provide sufficiently informed feedback.

Toward the end of the fall semester of the second year of an initial three-year appointment, after reviewing feedback from the tenured faculty members who participated in the review, the ADFD will hold a meeting with the pre-tenure colleague in order to synthesize and discuss the feedback. This meeting is also an opportunity for the pre-tenure colleague to ask questions about the criteria that guide personnel decisions or to seek guidance on the preparation of materials for the contract renewal review. The pre-tenure colleague may invite any other party to this conversation if they choose. Following that meeting, the ADFD will contact the candidate and the two faculty reviewers informing them that the process has been completed.

After the third year of employment, the ADFD will contact the pre-tenure colleague to see what questions or concerns, if any, they might have in anticipation of the tenure review. This may be an opportunity for the pre-tenure colleague to ask, for example, about the process for developing the list of external reviewers who comment on professional activity for the purposes of the Personnel Committee tenure review.

4. Contract Renewal

Tenure-track faculty with a six-year probationary period will be reviewed by the Faculty Personnel Committee early in the fall of the third year after their initial appointments. If this review is successful, the Committee will recommend that the individual be given a three-year extension of their contract. For the contract renewal, faculty should submit the items described in “Collection of Information,” below, with the exception of names for external review. See below and [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 3 for the criteria for evaluation.

5. Tenure Review

The faculty member will be reviewed for tenure and promotion to associate professor – if they are an assistant professor – in the fall of their sixth year. The Personnel committee will tender its recommendations regarding reappointment or non-reappointment of such faculty in a timely

enough manner so that the faculty member and their department can be notified by the end of the fall semester. A faculty member who has been denied tenure will receive a terminal one-year appointment. Tenure-track faculty with probationary periods shorter than six years will undergo a contract renewal review in the fall of their second year, followed by a tenure review in the fall of the fourth year. See below and [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 3 for the criteria to evaluation.

6. Extensions of the Probationary Period

The [Faculty Code](#) CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 1.A contains the guidelines for time in rank.

A faculty member on a tenure-track appointment may apply for an extension of the normal four-year or six-year period prior to review for tenure because of personal illness, childcare, care of a seriously ill or injured person, or other factors beyond the faculty member's control – such as COVID – that significantly hinder the performance of the usual range of duties associated with being a successful faculty member, i.e. teaching, scholarship, and service.

The length of the extension will be based upon an assessment of the degree to which these factors interfere with the normal responsibilities of the faculty member. The granting of such extensions does not increase the expectations for teaching, professional activity, and service. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1 Art. IV, Sec. 3.

Extensions may be granted in one-year increments up to a total of two years, although these years need not be consecutive.

C. Criteria for Evaluation

The criteria the Personnel Committee uses in the evaluation process can be found in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 3. The Faculty Personnel Committee is also guided by [Discipline-Specific Guidelines](#) that are regularly updated and found on the Provost and Dean of the Faculty website. In cases where the Faculty Code and Discipline Specific Guidelines and/or other documents are perceived to be in conflict, the language of the Faculty Code shall be used to make a final determination. The Provost also abides by the Faculty Code criteria in making a recommendation to the President.

If there have been changes to the evaluation criteria in the Faculty Code

since a candidate for tenure and promotion was hired, faculty can elect to be evaluated by the criteria in effect at the time of hire or by the new evaluation criteria. If there have been changes to the evaluation criteria between the time of tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and the time of candidacy for Professor, the candidate can choose to be evaluated by the current evaluation criteria or by the evaluation criteria at the time of the last review. The candidate needs to inform the Provost at the time of submitting their file which criteria they have selected. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 3.

D. Interactions between the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Provost's Office

1. Administrative Membership on the Faculty Personnel Committee

The President and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will sit as ex-officio, non-voting members of the committee. The Provost and dean of the Faculty shall be present, but not participate in the Faculty Personnel Committee discussion of a candidate, unless asked. At the close of the discussion, but before the vote on the candidate, the Committee shall ask the Provost and Dean of the Faculty if they have anything to add for the Committee's consideration. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IX, Sec. 13.B.

2. Expectations of Recusal for Faculty Personnel Committee Members and the Role of the Provost in Recusal

In faculty personnel decisions, the College seeks to avoid all possible questions about the participation in the personnel review process of any persons who, by the virtue of a close personal relationship to a candidate for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, may have a conflict of interest or whose participation in the process may appear to introduce a conflict of interest.

If any member of the Faculty Personnel Committee has any concern about their capacity to exercise impartial and fair judgment regarding a faculty member under review for reappointment, tenure, and/or promotion, that member must recuse themselves from the Committee's deliberations regarding that candidate. Upon election, the Faculty Personnel Committee members elected should make all possible arrangements to avoid conflicts of interest; if that is not possible, then they must recuse

themselves from the Committee's deliberations on that case. In addition, sitting members and members-elect of the Faculty Personnel Committee may not write letters of recommendation for any faculty member currently under review by this body. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty may discuss the issue of recusal with any member of the Faculty Personnel Committee.

Should it be necessary for a current member of the Faculty Personnel Committee to recuse themselves in any given case, the Chair of the Faculty will select a recent former member of the Committee to participate in the deliberations regarding the candidate in question. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. I, Art. IX, Sec. 13.B.

3. Provost Office Support for Faculty Personnel Committee

- a. At the beginning of each academic year, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will provide the Faculty Personnel Committee with a list of the faculty members to be evaluated in each of the various categories, and a timetable for deliberations that will ensure timely notice to candidates.
- b. Prior to evaluating candidate files, the members of the FPC shall undergo training in recognizing these biases with regard to equity, diversity, and inclusion when considering the materials submitted by the candidates. This training is conducted by the Associate Dean for Faculty Development and the Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion. In addition, the committee members will devote time to reflect on the short and long-term impact of COVID on faculty performance and review.
- c. Each candidate will be advised in writing by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty of the impending evaluation and will be requested to supply information as described below in "Collection of Information".

E. Collection of Information

The primary responsibility for the collection of information lies with the candidate. Faculty members planning to submit an application for tenure or promotion will find it useful to consult the Provost website for additional information not found in this chapter of the Faculty Handbook.

1. In addition to those letters requested by the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all tenure-track departmental colleagues (other than those who are retired or are participating in the Salary Continuation Plan) to send letters to the FPC regarding the candidate's performance.
2. The candidate will present to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty:
 - a. An updated vita.
 - b. A statement concerning the candidate's teaching and contributions to major and non-major advising. The teaching statement allows candidates to describe their activities that demonstrate excellence in teaching. In the statement, the candidate should provide their definition of excellent teaching. Based on this definition, candidates are responsible for describing how they have worked to achieve excellence as a teacher. Excellence can take many forms, including but not limited to, the trials of new pedagogical techniques, the creation of supplementary teaching materials, the design of courses, or the integration of scholarship with teaching. In addition, candidates should assess their instructional activities. Possible means of assessment should include student feedback. Finally, this statement should contain the candidate's response to student course evaluations or prior committee evaluations.
 - c. A completed and signed Release of Information Form, supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, releasing student evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee as part of their review. In the case of contract renewal, evaluations are required from at least 2/3 of all classes satisfying the faculty member's normal teaching load at Whitman in the preceding two years.

For decisions on the granting of tenure or promotion to Professor, evaluations are required from at least eight of the twelve most recently taught courses satisfying the faculty member's normal teaching load at Whitman. Upon receipt of this form, the Office of the Provost and Dean of Faculty will obtain electronic copies of the evaluations noted on the form from the Office of Institutional Research. Evaluations from a variety of courses representing the range of the candidate's teaching activities will be expected. The standard form provided by the college will be used; however, the

candidate may append additional questions (quantitative or written) to the form if appropriate to a particular course.

- d. Class Materials (e.g. syllabi, reading lists, examinations).
- e. The names of at least three colleagues from within the college community from whom the candidate has requested letters. These letters should focus on aspects of teaching that will not be addressed by student evaluations or letters written by off-campus experts. Faculty can provide uniquely valuable information on such matters as the candidate's mastery of the field, whether the candidate's organization of the course is appropriate to the subject matter, and whether the information is provided at a level appropriate for the students of the course. Faculty comments on the candidate's class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and textbooks, as well as the pedagogical techniques implicit in the assignment and structure of the course, can be extremely useful to the evaluation process. In many cases, faculty can make insightful comments on the value of presentations, performances, and activities outside the classroom as well.

For the letter writer to be familiar with the teaching philosophy and objectives of the candidate under review, they might meet in advance with the candidate to discuss these matters. The candidate might also provide the letter writer with background about the courses to be evaluated, including earlier versions of the syllabus, if it has been taught more than once and if it has changed significantly. Guidelines for letter writers can be found on the Provost website, under [Personnel Review](#).

Visits to the classroom are an indispensable part of the review process. Letter writers should try to make at least two observations of the candidate's teaching, whether in a classroom or non-classroom setting. Letter writers might also write about team-teaching experiences and observations made during guest visits to classes. In the visit, faculty will want to determine whether the candidate's teaching philosophy and the objectives implicit in the syllabus are upheld in the actual teaching situation.

-
- f. The candidate's assessment of prior professional activity and its impact on the educational program of the College, and a plan for the future.
 - g. Appropriate evidence of professional activity (e.g. publications, papers delivered at professional meetings, letters of review, external evaluations for productions and exhibits).
 - h. A candidate for tenure or promotion to professor will provide a list of the names of a minimum of eight and a maximum of ten established scholars, artists, or performers in the candidate's field. The list will be constructed by the candidate in consultation with the candidate's Department Chair and the Associate Dean for Faculty Development. From this list, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will request four letters of evaluation for the candidate.

For all names submitted, the candidate will provide a justification for each reviewer on the list. The candidate should disclose the nature of the relationship they have with the potential external reviewer. Generally, the external letter writer should have no close personal or professional relationship to the candidate, however, should this be necessary, the candidate will need to provide a particularly strong argument for their inclusion. The candidate may also identify up to four of the potential external reviewers in their list of eight to ten as preferred reviewers from which at least three of the final letters will be solicited.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will review the final list of external reviewers and in consultation with the ADFD will identify four reviewers. These four reviewers will include at least three reviewers from the candidate's preferred list, if preferences are provided, and will seek to balance reviewers from the various fields in which the candidate works. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will return to the original list should additional reviewers need to be identified. In the event that all reviewers from the original list are exhausted, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will ask the candidate to identify additional reviewers, again in consultation with the department chair and the ADFD.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty's office will provide those reviewers agreeing to submit a letter of evaluation with information regarding their role in the review process and will request that

reviewers submit their current C.V. along with an assessment of the candidate's professional activity.

The candidate will submit appropriate evidence of professional activity (see letter g above) for the external reviewers to read. They may choose to include a short introduction to those materials but should not provide their own assessment of the professional activity (see letter f above). The Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will make available to reviewers the materials submitted by the candidate and will serve as liaison between the candidate and the reviewer for any additional materials requested by the reviewers.

The Faculty Personnel Committee will not be made aware of which letters were specifically requested by the candidate and which were selected by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. All letters from external reviewers will be considered equally by the FPC.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will determine the compensation to be offered to outside reviewers.

- i. A statement summarizing the candidate's service to the College or community.
 - j. A current annual faculty activity report (January 1 of the current calendar year through the review deadline date).
 - k. Any other information the candidate believes is pertinent to the review. It is the candidate's responsibility to submit additional or updated material to the Provost's Office
 - l. With the exception of letters by external reviewers solicited as part of a candidate's initial file, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty Office shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in their file before that letter is considered by the Faculty Personnel Committee. The content of letters from internal and external reviewers are kept confidential by the Faculty Personnel Committee.
3. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will provide:
- a. The candidate's annual faculty activity reports for the last four years.

- b. The candidate's past review letter(s).
- c. When appropriate, evaluations of professional activity by colleagues at other institutions.

F. The Provost's Role in Recommendations

The Faculty Personnel Committee will vote to recommend to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the President for or against tenure, promotion, or contract renewal.

The recommendations of the Faculty Personnel Committee will be sent to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the President along with a summary of its conclusions in each case.

The information in this section is also found in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. III, Sec. 7.

G. Review Procedures for Tenure, Promotion, and Contract Renewal Cases and the Provost's Role

Following its review, if the Personnel Committee offers a negative recommendation for a faculty member regarding contract renewal, tenure, and/or promotion, the Committee will communicate that recommendation in writing to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will communicate the negative recommendation to the President. If the President, in consulting with the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, concurs with the recommendation, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will send a letter to the faculty member notifying the faculty member of that recommendation. In that letter, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will explain to the faculty member that they have two weeks to request that a review committee be appointed. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. III, Sec. 7.C.

If the candidate submits such a request, the Provost will form a review committee in accordance with the following guidelines.

The Review Committee shall consist of the three most senior members and the two most junior tenured members of the full-time teaching faculty, subject to the following specifications:

1. Senior and Junior rank shall be determined according to the total length

- of service with the College.
2. Senior members will be selected first.
 3. No members of the original Faculty Personnel Committee will be included.
 4. The Review Committee shall be chosen by the Provost to assure representation of the three divisions. Following the exclusions of members of the original Faculty Personnel Committee, divisional representation on the Review Committee will be assured by passing over successive persons at the upper end of the seniority list until all three divisions are represented.
 5. The Provost will instruct the Review Committee to conduct its inquiry in order to “determine whether the decision was the result of adequate consideration in terms of the relevant standards of Whitman College as expressed in the current procedures and criteria for evaluation.” This standard is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. I, Art. III, Sec. 7.C. The Review Committee shall not substitute its judgment on the merits of the candidate for that of the Faculty Personnel Committee. For that reason, the only materials the Review Committee will consider are the elements of the initial application, the Provost's letter conveying the negative decision to the faculty member, and the faculty member's letter of appeal.
 6. If the Review Committee concludes that adequate consideration was not given to the faculty member's qualifications (for tenure, promotion, or renewal), it will request reconsideration by the FPC, indicating the respects in which it believes the consideration may have been inadequate. It will direct its findings to the faculty member, with copies to the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and the President.
 7. If the Review Committee believes that adequate consideration was given to the candidate's qualifications (for tenure, promotion, or renewal) by the FPC, the Committee will direct its finding to the faculty member, with copies to the Faculty Personnel Committee, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and the President.
 8. At the close of the process indicated in G-6 above, should the Review Committee find insufficient reason to return the case to the Personnel Committee for reconsideration, or should the Faculty Personnel Committee, following such reconsideration, affirm its initial

recommendation, the candidate will have thirty days to respond or to discuss the matter with the President, or the President's designate, before the decision is entered into the candidate's file.

H. Periodic Review of Tenured Faculty

Each tenured faculty member shall be evaluated in every fifth year following the tenure. The evaluation shall be conducted by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the faculty member's Division Chair. This information is also available in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 5.A.

The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for the collection of the following materials to be used by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the appropriate Division Chair:

1. Activity Reports from the five-year period preceding the review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current activity report. Past activity reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.
2. Three letters from colleagues from within the institution who have observed the candidate's teaching through at least two classroom visits and are familiar with the candidate's instructional aims, organization, and materials.
3. Student evaluations from two-thirds of the courses taught in the preceding four years of teaching.
4. An updated vita.
5. A self-assessment regarding teaching, professional activity, and service to the College in the preceding five-year period as well as plans in each of these three areas for the next five-year period.

The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all departmental colleagues to submit letters regarding the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service to the department, the College, and the community.

After consulting with the appropriate Division Chair, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will arrange a meeting with the faculty member being reviewed, and, at the discretion of the faculty member, the appropriate

Division Chair. In the event that the faculty member is a Division Chair, that person may elect to have the Chair of the Faculty at this meeting. The meeting will provide the opportunity for the faculty member and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty to have a dialogue about the evaluation.

Within three weeks of the meeting, the faculty member will receive a written letter from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty summarizing their conversation. The faculty member may respond in written form. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty's letter and any written response from the faculty member will be added to the faculty member's file for consultation in subsequent reviews.

In the event that the faculty member disagrees with the assessment made by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, the faculty member may petition the Division Chairs and the Chair of the Faculty, who will conduct an independent evaluation. Any review by the Division Chairs and Chair of the Faculty will result in a written report that will be sent to the President of the College, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the faculty member, and will be added to the faculty member's file. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#) CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 5.C.

I. Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty

1. Lecturers

a. Annual Review

Lecturers are expected to complete a Faculty Activity Report each year. The Activity Report will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), or by the Associate Dean of the Faculty. Activity Reports are used annually to inform decision-making about salary increases.

b. Formative Review

During their fourth semester at Whitman, the lecturer will participate in a formative review designed to provide faculty members with timely feedback on their teaching. This feedback can be used to confirm the success of current practices, identify areas and strategies for improvement, and provide guidance in the

preparation of the dossier for promotion to senior status. The formative review is intended for individual use and plays no role in more formal evaluations.

At the beginning of the second year after an initial appointment the Associate Dean for Faculty Development (ADFD) will provide information to the faculty member regarding the purpose of the formative review and the process to be followed. In consultation with the ADFD, the faculty member will identify at least two tenured faculty members (or non-tenure-track faculty with senior status) who will visit a minimum of two class sessions. At least one of the colleagues should be a member of the candidate's department. In addition, the ADFD and the faculty member will discuss what other sources of information will offer the opportunity for meaningful feedback.

Toward the end of the spring semester of the second year, after reviewing feedback from the tenured or senior faculty who participated in the review, the ADFD will hold a meeting with the candidate to synthesize and discuss the feedback. The candidate may invite any other party to this conversation if they choose. Following that meeting, the ADFD will contact the candidate and the two faculty reviewers to inform them the process has been completed.

c. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

After at least four years of full-time teaching, a Lecturer may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer. Lecturers considering applying for promotion should notify the Provost and Dean of the Faculty by August 31st of the academic year in which the promotion review will occur. The review will be conducted by the Faculty Personnel Committee in accordance with the process specified below. Following that review, the FPC will make a recommendation to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty as to whether the individual should be promoted to Senior Lecturer. If the promotion is denied, it is strongly recommended that the Lecturer wait for two years before undergoing another review for promotion.

Candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer must submit to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty the

following materials to be reviewed by the Faculty Personnel Committee:

- i. An updated curriculum vita.
- ii. The names of at least three colleagues from within the college community from whom the candidate has requested letters. These letters should focus on aspects of teaching that will not be addressed by student evaluations or letters written by off-campus experts. Faculty can provide uniquely valuable information on such matters as the candidate's mastery of the field, whether the candidate's organization of the course is appropriate to the subject matter, and whether the information is provided at a level appropriate for students of the course. Faculty comments on the candidate's class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and textbooks, as well as the pedagogical techniques implicit in the assignment and structure of the course, can be extremely useful in the evaluation process. In many cases, faculty can make insightful comments on the value of presentations, performances, and activities outside the classroom as well.

For the letter writer to be familiar with the teaching philosophy and objectives of the candidate under review, they might meet in advance with the candidate to discuss these matters. The candidate might also provide the letter writer background about the courses to be evaluated, including earlier versions of the syllabus, if it has been taught more than once and if it has changed significantly. Guidelines for letter writers can be found on the Provost website, under [Personnel Review](#).

Visits to the classroom are an indispensable part of the review process. Letter writers should try to make at least two observations of the candidate's teaching, whether in a classroom or non-classroom setting. Letter writers might also write about team-teaching experiences and observations made during guest visits to classes. In the visit, faculty will want to determine whether the candidate's teaching philosophy and the objectives implicit in the syllabus are upheld in the actual teaching situation.

-
- iii. A completed and signed Release of Information Form, supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, releasing student evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee as part of their review. Evaluations are required from at least eight of the twelve most recently taught courses satisfying the faculty member's normal teaching load at Whitman. Upon the receipt of this form, the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will obtain electronic copies of the evaluations noted on the form from the Office of Institutional research. Evaluations from a variety of courses representing the range of the candidate's teaching activities will be expected. The standard form provided by the College will be used; however, the candidate may append additional questions (quantitative or written) to the form if appropriate to a particular course.
 - iv. Class materials (e.g. syllabi, student assignments, reading lists, examinations).
 - v. A statement about their teaching, including course goals and student learning outcomes, in the context of the criteria for excellent teaching at Whitman College. The statement should also contain a discussion of future plans in regards to their teaching.
 - vi. A statement describing the candidate's recent or planned contributions in the area of service to the College and potential broader impacts on campus.
 - vii. Annual Faculty Activity reports from each year preceding the review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current activity report. Past activity reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.

In addition to those letters requested by the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all tenure-track departmental colleagues (other than those who are retired or participating in the Salary Continuation Plan) to send letters to the Faculty Personnel Committee regarding the candidate's performance. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in their file before that letter is considered by the FPC.

As with tenure-track faculty, the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Provost will use the standards for excellence in teaching specified in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 3.A. Although the service expectation of Lecturers seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer is less demanding than that of tenure-track faculty members, the same criteria specified in the Faculty Code will be employed in their review.

While not expected of non-tenure-track appointments, professional activity may be included as part of the review materials, and will be considered as part of the candidate's contribution to the broader academic program of the College.

2. Senior Lecturers

a. Review of Rolling Appointment

Senior Lecturers hold rolling appointments, which typically continue indefinitely. In the event that a faculty member's review results in their not being retained, they will be informed by March 15 that the appointment has ceased to roll beyond the next academic year. The decision to halt the appointment will be the Provost's, in consultation with the Department Chair and Division Chair. If the appointment has ceased to roll, the subsequent academic year is considered the second year of the two-year appointment, and the Senior Lecturer's appointment ends at the end of that year.

b. Annual Review of Faculty Activity Report

Senior Lecturers must complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report each year. The Activity Report will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty each year and will be assessed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), or their designee. Activity reports are used annually to inform decision-making about salary increases.

c. Periodic Review

Senior Lecturers will be evaluated every fifth year following their initial appointment to senior rank. This review shall be conducted by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty or their designee, in

consultation with the Senior Lecturer's division chair.

The Senior Lecturer being evaluated is responsible for the collection of the following materials to be used by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty or their designee as well as the appropriate department and division chair:

- i. Activity reports from each year since the most recent review. The Senior Lecturer being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current activity report. Past activity reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.
- ii. The names of three colleagues at Whitman from whom the individual has requested letters of reference. These letters need to address the quality of the individual's teaching, though they may address other aspects of the individual's performance as well. The individuals writing the letters should have observed at least two classes taught by the individual under evaluation.
- iii. Student evaluations from two-thirds of the courses taught in the preceding four years of teaching.
- iv. Un updated curriculum vita.
- v. A self-assessment regarding teaching, including course goals and student learning outcomes, and service to the College in the current contract period as well as future plans in each of these areas.
- vi. While not expected of this position, professional activity may be included as part of the review materials and will be considered as part of the candidate's overall contribution to the broader academic program of the College.

In addition to the letters requested by the individual, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all departmental colleagues to submit letters regarding the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service to the department, College and community. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in their file before that letter is considered by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the appropriate division chair.

After consulting with the appropriate division chair, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will arrange a meeting with the Senior Lecturer being reviewed, and, at the discretion of the Senior Lecturer, their division chair. The meeting will provide the opportunity for the Senior Lecturer and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty to have a conversation about the evaluation.

Within three weeks of the meeting, the Senior Lecturer will receive a written letter from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty summarizing their conversation. The Senior Lecturer may respond in written form. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty's letter and any written response from the Senior Lecturer will be added to the Senior Lecturer's file for consultation in subsequent reviews.

In the event that the Senior Lecturer and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty disagree on the content of the written letter, the Senior Lecturer may petition the Division Chairs and the Chair of the Faculty, who will conduct an independent evaluation. Any review by the Division Chairs and Chair of the Faculty will result in a written report that will be sent to the President of the College, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and the Senior Lecturer, and will be added to the Senior Lecturer's file. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 5.C.

3. Visiting Assistant Professors and Visiting Instructors

Visiting Assistant Professors and Visiting Instructors are expected to submit student evaluations of all their courses each semester. They may complete an Annual Faculty Activity Report but are not required to do so. Student evaluations and the Activity Report will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the individual's Department Chair. The materials may be used for the assessment of the individual's potential for reappointment, in cases where the ongoing need for their expertise has been demonstrated.

4. Adjunct Assistant Professors and Adjunct Instructors

a. Annual Review

Adjunct faculty members are expected to submit student evaluations for all of their courses each semester and complete an

Annual Faculty Activity Report each year. Student evaluations and the Activity Report will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the faculty member's department chair.

The College is under no obligation to renew the appointment of adjunct faculty. If the department would like to rehire an individual for an additional year, the chair of the department should make the case for renewal in the annual course plan and staffing request that is submitted every fall. The Provost and Dean of the faculty will have the final authority to extend the appointment for an additional year. If a tenure-track search is opened, an adjunct faculty member may choose to be a candidate for the position, but the College is under no obligation to interview or appoint that individual to the position.

b. Promotion to Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor or Senior Adjunct Instructor

After at least four years of teaching half-time, an Adjunct Assistant Professor or Instructor may apply for promotion to the rank of Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor or Senior Adjunct Instructor. Because an adjunct faculty member's load may vary from year to year (e.g., 40% one year and 60% the next), half-time may be defined as the average over a period of four or more years. If a faculty member does not teach for a year, they may still apply for promotion (i.e. not teaching for a year does not "restart the clock"). Individual cases may vary and faculty members considering promotion should contact the Provost and Dean of the Faculty to discuss the possibility of applying for promotion.

Adjunct faculty considering applying for promotion should notify the Provost and Dean of the Faculty by August 31 of the academic year in which the promotion review will occur. The review will be conducted by the Faculty Personnel Committee in accordance with the process specified below. Following that review, the Faculty Personnel Committee will make a recommendation to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty as to whether the individual should be promoted to the Senior rank. If the promotion is denied, it is strongly recommended that the faculty member wait for two years

to undergo another review for promotion.

Candidates for promotion to the Senior rank must submit to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty the following materials to be reviewed by the Faculty Personnel Committee:

- i. An updated curriculum vita.
- ii. The names of at least three colleagues from within the college community from whom the candidate has requested letters. These letters should focus on aspects of teaching that will not be addressed by student evaluations or letters written by off-campus experts. Faculty can provide uniquely valuable information on such matters as the candidate's mastery of the field, whether the candidate's organization of the course is appropriate to the subject matter, and whether the information is provided at a level appropriate for the students of the course. Faculty comments on the candidate's class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and textbooks, as well as the pedagogical techniques implicit in the assignment and structure of the course, can be extremely useful to the evaluation process. In many cases, faculty can make insightful comments on the value of presentations, performances, and activities outside the classroom as well.

For the letter writer to be familiar with the teaching philosophy and objectives of the candidate under review, they might meet in advance with the candidate to discuss these matters. The candidate might also provide the letter writer with background about the courses to be evaluated, including earlier versions of the syllabus, if it has been taught more than once and if it has changed significantly. Guidelines for letter writers can be found on the Provost website, under [Personnel Review](#).

- iii. A completed and signed Release of Information Form, supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, releasing student evaluations to the Faculty Personnel Committee as part of their review. Evaluations are required from all courses taught at Whitman. Upon receipt of this form, the Office of the

Provost and Dean of Faculty will obtain electronic copies of the evaluations noted on the form from the Office of Institutional Research. The standard form provided by the college will be used; however, the candidate may append additional questions (quantitative or written) to the form if appropriate to a particular course.

- iv. Class materials (e.g. syllabi, student assignments, reading lists, examinations).
- v. A statement about their teaching, including course goals and student learning outcomes, in the context of the criteria for excellent teaching at Whitman College. The statement should also contain a discussion of future plans in regards to their teaching.
- vi. A statement describing the candidate's recent or planned contributions in the area of service to the College and potential broader impacts on campus.
- vii. Activity Reports from the four-year period preceding the review, or since the last review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current Activity Report. Past Activity Reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.

In addition to those letters requested by the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all tenure-track departmental colleagues (other than those who are retired or are participating in the Salary Continuation Plan) to send letters to the Faculty Personnel Committee regarding the candidate's performance. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in their file before that letter is considered by the FPC.

As with tenure-track faculty, the Faculty Personnel Committee and the Provost will use the standards for excellence in teaching specified in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. I, Art. IV, Sec. 3.A. Although the service expectation of faculty seeking promotion to the rank of Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor or Instructor is less demanding than that of tenure-track faculty members, the same criteria, specified in Faculty Code, will be employed in their review.

In evaluating the candidate's achievements with respect to these items, the Faculty Personnel Committee will consider the candidate's written statement, peer and student evaluations, and the quality of course materials. In reviewing student evaluations of teaching, the Committee pays particular attention to patterns in student responses. While not expected of non-tenure-track appointments, any research or other professional activity may be included as part of the review materials and will be considered as part of the candidate's contribution to the broader academic program of the College.

5. Senior Adjunct Assistant Professors and Senior Adjunct Instructors

a. Annual Review

Senior Adjunct faculty must complete and submit an Annual Faculty Activity Report each year. The Activity Report will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), or the Associate Deans of the Faculty. Activity reports are used annually to inform decision-making about salary increases.

The College is under no obligation to renew the appointment of an individual in a Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor or Senior Adjunct Instructor position. If a tenure-track search is opened, an individual in a Senior appointment may choose to be a candidate for the position, but the College is under no obligation to interview or appoint that individual. If a department wishes to retain a Senior Adjunct faculty member for an additional term, the chair of the department should make that recommendation in the annual request for non-tenure-track positions.

Typically, Senior Adjunct faculty are hired on yearly renewable appointments and are offered courses in response to curricular imperatives (e.g., ongoing enrollment pressures that cannot otherwise be met, the need to have courses taught that are required to complete a major but that cannot otherwise be offered, etc.). The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will make the final determination regarding the courses to be offered in any given year.

b. Periodic Review

Senior Adjunct faculty will be evaluated every fifth year following their initial appointment to the Senior rank. This review shall be conducted by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty or their designee in consultation with the faculty member's division chair.

The Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor/Instructor being evaluated is responsible for the collection of the following materials to be used by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty as well as the appropriate department and division chair:

- i. Activity Reports from each year since the most recent review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current activity report. Past activity reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.
- ii. The names of at least three colleagues from within the college community from whom the candidate has requested letters. These letters should focus on aspects of teaching that will not be addressed by student evaluations or letters written by off-campus experts. Faculty can provide uniquely valuable information on such matters as the candidate's mastery of the field, whether the candidate's organization of the course is appropriate to the subject matter, and whether the information is provided at a level appropriate for the students of the course. Faculty comments on the candidate's class materials, including syllabi, assignments, and textbooks, as well as the pedagogical techniques implicit in the assignment and structure of the course, can be extremely useful to the evaluation process. In many cases, faculty can make insightful comments on the value of presentations, performances, and activities outside the classroom as well.

For the letter writer to be familiar with the teaching philosophy and objectives of the candidate under review, they might meet in advance with the candidate to discuss these matters. The candidate might also provide the letter writer with background about the courses to be evaluated, including earlier versions of the syllabus, if it has been taught more than once and if it has changed significantly. Guidelines for letter

writers can be found on the Provost website, under [Personnel Review](#).

Visits to the classroom are an indispensable part of the review process. Letter writers should try to make at least two observations of the candidate's teaching, whether in a classroom or non-classroom setting. Letter writers might also write about team-teaching experiences and observations made during guest visits to classes. In the visit, faculty will want to determine whether the candidate's teaching philosophy and the objectives implicit in the syllabus are upheld in the actual teaching situation.

- iii. Student evaluations from all the courses taught since the last review.
- iv. An updated vita.
- v. A self-assessment regarding teaching and service to the College in the current appointment period as well as future plans in each of these areas.
- vi. While not expected of this position, professional activity may be included as part of the appointment review materials and will be considered as part of the candidate's contribution to the broader academic program of the College.

In addition to the letters requested by the candidate, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will invite all departmental colleagues to submit letters regarding the candidate's performance in the areas of teaching, professional activity, and service to the department, College and community. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty shall notify the candidate of the source of any letter in their file before that letter is considered by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the appropriate division chair.

After consulting with the appropriate division chair, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty will arrange a meeting with the Senior Adjunct Assistant Professor/Instructor being reviewed, and, at the discretion of the faculty member, their division chair. The meeting will provide the opportunity for the Senior Adjunct faculty member and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty to have a conversation about the evaluation.

Within three weeks of the meeting, the Senior Adjunct faculty member will receive a written letter from the Provost and Dean of the Faculty summarizing their conversation. The Senior Adjunct faculty member may respond in written form. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty's letter and any written response from the Senior Adjunct faculty member will be added to the Senior Adjunct faculty member's file for consultation in subsequent reviews.

In the event that the Senior Adjunct faculty member and the Provost and Dean of the Faculty disagree on the content of the written letter, the Senior Adjunct faculty member may petition the Division Chairs and the Chair of the Faculty, who will conduct an independent evaluation. Any review by the Division Chairs and Chair of the Faculty will result in a written report that will be sent to the President of the College, the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, and the Senior Adjunct faculty member, and will be added to the Senior Adjunct faculty member's file. This information is also in the [Faculty Code](#), CH. 1, Art. IV, Sec. 5.C.

J. Evaluation and Promotion of Non-Tenure-Track Faculty in SSRA

1. Adjunct Instructors and Senior Adjunct Instructors in SSRA

Adjunct Instructors and Senior Adjunct Instructors in SSRA are part-time and teach activity courses in the SSRA department. They are expected to collect student evaluations of all of their courses and complete an Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Report each year. These evaluations and the Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Reports will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), or the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the Director of Athletics, who will make recommendations to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty regarding courses and appointment renewals for the following year. The Provost and Dean of the Faculty will be the final arbiter of course offerings and appointments for any given year.

Adjunct Instructors are normally eligible for promotion to the rank of Senior Adjunct Instructor after teaching thirty course credits. Adjunct Instructors considering applying for promotion should notify the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty by August 31 of the academic year in which the promotion review will occur.

Adjunct Instructors in SSRA who are candidates for promotion to the rank of Senior Adjunct Instructor in SSRA must submit to the Director of Athletics and the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty the following materials, to be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the Director of Athletics:

- a. An updated curriculum vita.
- b. The names of three colleagues at Whitman from whom the individual has requested letters of reference. These letters need to address the quality of the individual's teaching, though they may address other issues as well. The individual writing the letter should have observed at least two classes taught by the individual under evaluation.
- c. Student evaluations for all courses taught at the College. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting their most recent evaluations. Past student evaluations will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.
- d. A statement about teaching, including course learning goals and student learning outcomes, and plans for the future.
- e. Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Reports from the years preceding the review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting a current activity report. Past activity reports will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.

2. Lecturers in SSRA

a. Annual Review

Lecturers in SSRA are expected to evaluate all of their courses and athletic programs each year and complete an Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Report. These evaluations and the Activity Reports will be submitted to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review all such materials), or the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the Director of Athletics.

b. Formative Review

During their fourth semester at Whitman, the Lecturer in SSA will participate in a formative review designed to provide faculty

members with timely feedback on their teaching and coaching. This feedback can be used to confirm the success of current practices, identify areas and strategies for improvement, and provide guidance in the preparation of the dossier for promotion to senior status. The formative review is intended for individual use and plays no role in more formal evaluations.

At the beginning of the second year after an initial appointment, the Associate Dean for Faculty Development (ADFD) and the Director of Athletics will provide information to the Lecturer in SSRA regarding the purpose of the formative review and the process to be followed. In consultation with the ADFD and Director of Athletics, the Lecturer in SSRA will identify at least two Senior Lecturers in SSRA who will act as mentors over the next two years to work towards promotion. These mentors should engage with the Lecturer in SSRA through observation of practices or games, as well as discussions regarding coaching.

Toward the end of the spring semester of the second year, after reviewing feedback from the two Senior Lecturers in SSRA and the Director of Athletics, the ADFD will hold a meeting with the Lecturer to synthesize and discuss the feedback. The Lecturer in SSRA may invite any other party to this discussion if they choose. Following that meeting, the ADFD will contact the Lecturer, the two mentors, and the Director of Athletics, informing them that the process has been completed.

Lecturers planning for promotion to Senior Lecturer in SSRA should be cognizant of the need to gradually increase their level of participation and leadership in the areas of departmental and/or College and/or professional service and/or administration over time.

c. Promotion to Senior Lecturer

Lecturers in SSRA are normally eligible for promotion to the rank of Senior Lecturer in SSRA after four years at the rank of Lecturer in SSRA. During the fourth year of coaching as a Lecturer in SSRA, an individual holding that position will undergo an initial review by the Director of Athletics. The Director of Athletics will complete an evaluation of the candidate for Senior Lecturer in SSRA based on accumulated accomplishments in several areas, **criteria for**

evaluation under construction – will need a link to SSRA Handbook when it is done?]

Following that review, the Director of Athletics will make a recommendation to the Provost and Dean of the Faculty as to whether the individual should be promoted to the rank of Senior Lecturer. If promotion is denied, it is strongly recommended that the Lecturer wait for two years to undergo another review for promotion.

Lecturers in SSRA who are being considered for promotion must submit to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty and the Director of Athletics the materials in the list that follows, to be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, or the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the Director of Athletics:

- i. An updated curriculum vita.
- ii. The names of three colleagues at Whitman from whom the individual has requested letters of reference. These letters need to address the quality of the individual's coaching, recruiting, teaching, and service, though they may address other aspects of the individual's performance as well. The individual writing the letter should have observed at least two classes and/or practices taught/conducted by the individual under evaluation.
- iii. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the preceding eight semesters or since the last review. The faculty member being evaluated is responsible for submitting their most recent evaluations. Past student evaluations will be supplied by the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty.
- iv. A statement about coaching and teaching, including learning outcomes and their impact on student athletes, both in the context of the relevant sport and outside of it; strategies for achieving stated learning goals and their effectiveness; recruiting; plans for the future.
- v. A statement addressing the management of the candidate's athletic program, including budget management and accounting procedures, adherence to generally accepted safety

- and training standards, and adherence to NCAA and Northwest Conference compliance standards.
- vi. A statement describing the candidate's other contributions in the areas of professional activity and service to the department and College, for example: committees, working groups, departmental search committees, etc.; the administration of local, regional or national sports events; or participation in local, regional, or national professional organizations.
 - vii. Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Report for the current year (the Provost Office will provide activity reports from previous years).

[This list may be revised]

3. Senior Lecturers in SSRA

Senior Lecturers in SSRA should complete an Annual SSRA Faculty Activity Report each year, and submit it to the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty. The Activity report will be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty (who retains the right to review such materials), or the Associate Deans of the Faculty, and the Director of Athletics on an annual basis.

Senior Lecturers in SSRA will undergo a more substantive (periodic) review every five years, and must submit to the Director of Athletics and the Office of the Provost and Dean of the Faculty the following materials, to be reviewed by the Provost and Dean of the Faculty, or their designee, and the Director of Athletics:

- a. An updated curriculum vita.
- b. The names of three colleagues at Whitman from whom the individual has requested letters of reference. These letters need to address the quality of the individual's coaching, recruiting, teaching, and service, though they may address other issues as well. The individual writing the letter should have observed at least

- two classes and/or practices taught/conducted by the individual under evaluation.
- c. Student evaluations for all courses taught during the preceding four years, or since the last review.
 - d. A statement about coaching and teaching, including learning goals and outcomes and their impact on student athletes, both in the context of the relevant sport and outside of it; strategies for achieving stated learning goals and their effectiveness; recruiting; plans for the future.
 - e. A statement addressing the management of the candidate's athletic program, including budget management and accounting procedures, adherence to generally accepted safety and training standards, and adherence to NCAA and Northwest Conference compliance standards.
 - f. A statement describing the candidate's other contributions in the areas of professional activity and service to the department and College, for example: committees, working groups, oversight of facilities, managerial or advisory roles, etc.; the administration of local, regional or national sports events; or participation in local, regional, or national professional organization.
 - g. Annual SSA Faculty Activity Report for the current year (the Provost Office will provide activity reports received for the preceding years).

[This list may be revised.]